

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. Reconsideration of the subject patent application in view of the present remarks is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 is amended.

Claims 3, 5-8, 10-12, 14-19, and 21 are withdrawn

New claims 26-27 are added.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1, 2, 4, 9, 13 and 22-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shoji et al. (U.S. PG-PUB NO. 2002/0169010; hereinafter “Shoji”) in view of Schober (U.S. PATENT NO. 4,471,493). For the following reasons, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Regarding the amended claim 1, neither Shoji nor Schober, alone or in combination, discloses, teaches or renders foreseeable at least two feeding portions separate from each other along the rotation shaft in a prescribed gap.

Shoji does not disclose or teach that there are multiple transmitting circuits 15 (the alleged feeding portion). In Shoji, on paragraphs [0031]-[0033], although there may be a switching element for switching between terminals 23a and 23b, it merely shows switching between terminals 23a (connected to matching circuit 20) and 23b (connected to matching circuit 22) so that the reflection level and input impedance are suppressed at minimum level. Therefore, there is no disclosure on the arrangement in which the two feeding portions are separate from each other along the rotation shaft in a prescribed gap, as shown in claim 1. Schober is merely cited for a

rotation shaft provided in the connection portion, and a dipole antenna. Schober is silent about the above feature of the at least two feeding portions in the amended claim 1. Accordingly, the combination of Shoji and Schober does not meet all of the limitations of claim 1. Therefore, the asserted combination of Shoji and Schober does not render claim 1 obvious. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection as it applies to claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 4, 9, 13 and 22-25 which are directly or indirectly dependent from claim 1 should also be allowable for at least the same reason.

In addition, regarding claim 2, neither Shoji nor Schober, alone or in combination, discloses, teaches or renders foreseeable that a plurality of first antenna elements are provided in the first casing. The Office action states that a plurality of first antenna elements (Shoji, antenna 14, fig. 13) are provided in the first casing. However, the shield box 14 is a single antenna provided within the upper casing 3 (Shoji; paragraph [0027], line 5). There is no disclosure in Shoji that a plurality of antenna elements are provided in the upper casing 3. Schober is silent about providing a plurality of antenna elements in the first casing.

Regarding new claim 26, neither Shoji nor Schober, alone or in combination, discloses, teaches or renders foreseeable at least two hinge portions, each hinge portion connected to the respective feeding portion. Schober does not teach or suggest multiple flexible cables 9 (the alleged connection portion). Although Shoji does disclose two hinge portions 2, they do not correspond to the feeding portions, but merely connect the upper and lower cases mechanically.

In consideration of the foregoing analysis, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to

initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No.: NGB-37395.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By: 

Nobuhiko Sukenaga, Reg. No. 39446

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

DATE: January 4, 2010